

REMARKS

The Official Action of April 7, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain as claims 1-14, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuang '884 in view of Squires '387. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, especially as applied to the claims as amended.

As the Examiner will note, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 14 to more clearly locate the claimed "outer measuring rule" on the outer side of the corresponding cutting unit, and the claimed "inner measuring rule" on the inner side of the corresponding cutting unit.

In claim 1, in which first and second cutting units are claimed, the first outer measuring unit is located on the outer side of the first cutting unit, and the true-zero of the inner measuring rule is disposed at the reference line of the second cutting unit. This arrangement allows half of the

portion to be removed from a blind to be measured by the first outer measuring unit and then cut by the first cutting unit. Thereafter, the blind is moved without removing from the cutting machine to the second cutting unit where the desired length is set against the inner measuring rule and the opposite end cut by the second cutting unit.

In claim 14, only a single cutting unit is claimed. This arrangement requires reversing the blind after the first end is cut based on the outer measuring rule and then cutting the second end based on the inner measuring rule.

Clearly, neither Chuang nor Squires teaches an outer measuring rule as located and an inner measuring rule as located in combination to accomplish the intended purpose of the claimed invention. Both Chuang and Squires are limited to a measuring rule on one side of their cutting units. There is no teaching in either of the cited patents which suggests locating their respective measuring rules together in the manner claimed by Applicant for the purpose intended by the claimed invention.

As neither reference shows such feature, it follows that no combination thereof, even if obvious, could reach Applicant's claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/725,256
Amdt. dated August 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By Norman J. Latker
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\D\dire\NIEN35\Pto\Amendment-A.doc

by
J. M. Neimark
20520